

COMMISSIONERS
TOM FORESE – Chairman
BOB BURNS
DOUG LITTLE
ANDY TOBIN
BOB DUNN



0000177967

ORIGINAL

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

February 10, 2017

To: Docket Control

RE: ARIZONA PUBLIC SERVICE – Electric – Customer Comments
Docket # E-01345A-16-0036 & E-01345A-16-0123

Please docket the attached 3 customer comments OPPOSED to the above filed case.

Customer comments can be reviewed in E-docket under the above docket number.

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

MAR 13 2017

DOCKETED BY

GB

Filed by: Utilities Division – Consumer Services

ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKET CONTROL
2017 MAR 13 A 9:15

E-01345A-16-0123
E-01345A-16-0036

Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Roxanne Best **Phone:** <<< REDACTED >>> **Opinion Date:** 3/10/2017
Opinion Number: 2017 - 139542 **Priority:** Respond within 5 business days
Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed **Closed Date:** 3/10/2017 12:08 PM

First Name: Rick **Last Name:** Unknown **Account Name:** Rick Unknown
Address:
City: Phoenix **State:** AZ **Zip Code:** 85053
Home: <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Arizona Public Service Company **Division:** Electric

Nature Of Opinion

Docket Number: E-01345A-16-0123

In regards to the \$6 a month rate hike, I'm on Social Security disability. No raise in 4 years and I do not qualify for APS income discount, just over the limit. I'm squeezing utilities as much as possible. Thermostat in winter is at 68 degrees, when grandchildren come over I put it at 73. In the summer same thing I keep it at 85 and 80 for the children. I keep my electric off as much as possible to the point of using flashlights and I'm still paying \$150 a month for using almost nothing. I don't have disposable income, scraping to get by. Increases make it difficult to maintain and manage. I would appreciate the Commissioners reconsidering approving this rate increase. I know that Bob Burns cares, I worked with him in the Red Cross as a volunteer.

		Investigation	
Date:	Analyst:	Submitted By:	Type:
3/10/2017	Roxanne Best	Telephone	Investigation
Comments noted for record and docketed. Closed.			

E-01345A-16-0123

E-01345A-16-0036

Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Trish Meeter

Phone: <<< REDACTED >>>

Opinion Date: 3/10/2017

Opinion Number: 2017 - 139533

Priority: Respond within 5 business days

Opinion Codes: Rates and Tariffs - Interpretation of

Closed Date: 3/10/2017 9:23 AM

Rate Case Items - Opposed

First Name: Glenn

Last Name: France

Account Name: Glenn France

Address: <<< REDACTED >>>

City: Prescott

State: AZ

Zip Code: 86305

Cell: <<< REDACTED >>>

Email: <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Arizona Public Service Company

Division: Electric

Nature Of Opinion

Docket Number: E-01345A-16-0036

APS has agreed to a number of electric rate related changes/increases in regards to the APS electric rate case E-01345A-16-0036 before the Arizona Corporation Commission. The agreement reached with various interest groups comes down to an increase for non-solar residential consumers (myself included) of about 4.5% (\$6) per month. The important good takeaway is that the draconian demand charge portion of APS proposed residential increase will not be implemented at this time. The important bad takeaway is that the solar PV net metering amount is being reduced annually over the next 10 years and then eliminated completely. In my opinion, and in the opinion of the majority of APS customers, it should remain as is. In addition, there should be no new rates/fees/charges levied against solar PV residential or small business customers for so called "grid maintenance" as APS is saving millions of dollars per year by not having to build polluting power plants due to these distributed electricity inputs to their infrastructure. Please work on modifying that portion of the agreement to allow net metering to continue as is. With the cost of rooftop solar dropping rapidly, many more residential and small business APS customers will be installing solar PV in the near future, resulting in less capital outlays for APS long term. I have a couple of questions: 1. Why only 3 years for this rate change cycle instead of 5 years like the last rate case cycle? 2. Why is APS even asking for a rate increase when the value of their parent company's stock has increased from \$47.45 per share (March 9, 2012 stock price) to \$80.80 (as of this writing)? It appears that they have made enormous profits over the past 5 years and would continue to do so without any rate change at all. I propose that the Arizona Corporation Commission allows the current rate structure to continue for the next 5 years with no changes and then a new evaluation can again be made based on company performance over the next 5 year period in order to determine if a new rate change is needed. It doesn't appear that they need or deserve a rate increase at this time. Thank you for your time.

E-01345A-16-0036

Arizona Corporation Commission
Utilities Complaint Form

		Investigation	
Date:	Analyst:	Submitted By:	Type:
3/10/2017	Trish Meeter	Telephone	Investigation
sent to company as an Inquiry (No. 139521)			

E-01345A-16-0036

E. 01345A-16-0123 **Arizona Corporation Commission**
Utilities Complaint Form

Investigator: Trish Meeter

Phone: <<< REDACTED >>>

Opinion Date: 6/10/2016

Opinion Number: 2016 - 132198

Priority: Respond within 5 business days

Opinion Codes: Rate Case Items - Opposed

Closed Date: 6/10/2016 3:13 PM

First Name: Richard

Last Name: McKee

Account Name: Richard McKee

Address: <<< REDACTED >>>

City: Glendale

State: AZ

Zip Code: 85308

Home: <<< REDACTED >>>

Company: Arizona Public Service Company

Division: Electric

Nature Of Opinion

Docket Number: E-01345A-16-0036

Docket Position: Against

Numerous reasons why customer is opposed to the increase in rates proposed by the company.

12 million \$ for president (parent company) is unacceptable and no increase should be asked for. The solar problem that APS is having is self induced. Company's performance has brought nothing to AZ. 4 Corners is a liability and customers should not be held responsible for costs relating to it. Maintenance costs should not be part of the rate base. With the temporary lines laying on the ground rather than being addressed, and the costs to guard those line, could be better serviced by addressing in a timely fashion. Believes that Palo Verde is not owned by APS but rather Burcher Hathoway. Palo Verde costs should not be a burden to the customer.

3/9/2017 Comments entered by Mary Mee

Customer called with the following comments. He only wants them docketed.

Management should not roll out a system without knowing if it works. Online system requested a unknown 4 digit code to log in, so emailed company without getting a response and waited 35 minutes in queue until called away. Company reached and was transferred by CSR to tech who said they were working on it - should be working.

Concerns with outages - as on a Saturday, lights were out, but reason expressed for wireless meters is so Company would know immediately of an outage - power not back on until 2:30pm after call placed by 10am to Company. Company should monitor their equipment because outage issue was vegetation around transformer. They can do better.

Investigation

Date:

Analyst:

Submitted By:

Type:

6/10/2016

Trish Meeter

Telephone

Investigation

docketed